

# Interview Summary

Application No.

09/913,345

Applicant(s)

Li

Examiner

Atkinson

Art Unit

3243

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Atkinson

(3) Jan Lay; Alan Wang

(2) Mr. Lee; Mr. Rosenberg

(4) David Klein

Date of Interview 6/13/02

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1

Identification of prior art discussed:

Okayasu

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

applicant's proposed to amend Claim 1 to recite that the expansion area is externally mounted and adjacent to the fluidic loop. This will overcome the outstanding art rejection.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required